

REMARKS

The office action of March 24, 2006, has been carefully considered.

It is noted that the drawings are objected to for not supporting claims 14 and 15.

Claims 14 and 15 are objected to for containing various informalities.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim s 1-6 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the UK reference 2,219,270 to Phillip.

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Phillip in view of the patent to Havens et al.

Finally, it is noted that claims 9-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the drawings, applicant submits that those skilled in the art would readily understand how to carry out the steps of claims 14 and 15 without an illustration of how to carry out the steps. The method is carried out with blow-molding technology, which is well known in the art. Illustration of the steps involved in carrying out the invention recited in claims 14 and 15 is not necessary for a thorough understanding by those skilled in the art.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the drawings is overcome and should be withdrawn.

In view of the Examiner's rejections of the claims, applicant has canceled claims 2 and 6, amended claims 1, 3, 4, 14 and 15, and added new claims 16-19.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to claims 14 and 15, applicant has amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claims 14 and 15 as containing informalities is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims now on file particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to address the instances of indefiniteness pointed out by the Examiner.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is overcome and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims presently on file differ essentially and in an unobvious, highly advantageous manner from the constructions and methods disclosed in the references.

Turning now to the references, and particularly to Phillip, it can be seen that this reference discloses a container of electrically insulating material. On pages 8 and 9, in connection with Figs. 1 and 2, Phillip discloses a blow-molded L-ring container having a main body 11, a top 12, a bottom 13, and top and bottom L-ring carrying beads 14. The top 12 has two recesses 15 in each of which a screw-threaded neck 16 with an opening is arranged. For electrical grounding of the container, both

recesses 15 in the top 12 and the bottom 13 are provided with a metal coating. The body has an outer strip coating 17 and the bottom 13 has a metal coating that is electrically connected to the recesses 15 in the top 12 by the strip coating 17 so that the upper surface of the container is grounded.

The electrically conducting coating of the recesses 15 can extend into the orifice and even into the inner surface of the container (See page 5, lines 23-26 of Phillip).

Contrary to the container of Phillip, in the presently claimed invention electrically conductive plastic material is embedded or integrated in the plastic material of the barrel body, and the electrically conductive plastic material has the same thickness as the wall of the barrel body and forms the electrical connection between the inner surface and the outer surface of the barrel. Such a construction is not disclosed by Phillip. The conductive strip shown in Fig. 2 of Phillip is on the surface of the container. There is no disclosure of integrating the strip in the barrel body and giving the strip a thickness equal to the thickness of the wall of the barrel body, as in the presently claimed invention.

**PR-48**

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over the above-discussed reference is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The patent to Havens et al. discloses an antistatic/conductive container. The Examiner combined this reference with Phillip in determining that claims 7 and 8 would be unpatentable over such a combination. Applicant respectfully submits that neither of these references, nor their combination, teach a plastic barrel having an electrically conductive plastic material embedded or integrated in the plastic material of the barrel body, wherein the electrically conductive plastic material has the same thickness as the wall of the barrel body and forms the electrical connection between the inner surface and the outer surface of the barrel, as in the presently claimed invention.

In view of these considerations it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of the above-discussed references is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are

PR-48

respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or charges required at this time in connection with this application may be charged to Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 11-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Klaus P. Stoffel  
Reg. No. 31,668

For: Friedrich Kueffner  
Reg. No. 29,482  
317 Madison Avenue, Suite 910  
New York, New York 10017  
(212) 986-3114

Dated: July 24, 2006

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 24, 2006.

By:   
Klaus P. Stoffel

Date: July 24, 2006